

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Please enter the drawings as shown on the enclosed replacement sheets. The enclosed replacement sheets are identical in substance to the drawings submitted on July 18, 2005, and labeled in conformance with 37 CFR 1.121.

## REMARKS

This paper is presented in response to the non-final action mailed November 24, 2006, in which claims 1-24 were rejected. By this amendment, claims 1-2, 4-9, 12-17, 19, 21, and 23 are amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections and not to distinguish over the cited art. No new matter is added. As a result, claims 1-24 remain pending and at issue.

### Claim Objections

The applicants respectfully submit that the objections to claims 1 and 17 are moot in light of the amendments to claims 1 and 17.

### Objection to the Drawings

The applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the drawings. The Patent Office apparently objects to the drawings submitted on July 14, 2005, because the drawings did not include “replacement sheet” in the header. Thus, the applicants enclose herewith replacement sheets of Figs. 1-3 labeled in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. As a result, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

### 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-24 as indefinite. The enclosed amendments to claims 1-24 address the concerns expressed in the official action. As a result, claims 1-24 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the applicants regard as their invention. Thus, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-24.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-15 and 23-24 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,140 to Rowney et al. (“Rowney”). “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Each of claims 1-15 and 23-24 recites, *inter alia*, a method (or device) of generating forgery-proof documents comprising transmitting encrypted key information and encrypted checking information from a contact station to an intermediate station for temporary storage. Rowney fails to disclose or suggest these elements.

Rowney discloses a method of generating a combined block that is encrypted using a random encryption key. A merchant computer system forms a merchant's authorization request from the combined block and encrypted random key and transmits the merchant's authorization request directly to a payment gateway system. In other words, Rowney fails to disclose or suggest an intermediate station of any sort, let alone temporarily storing encrypted key information and encrypted checking information in such an intermediate station. Thus, Rowney fails to disclose or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in claims 1-15 and 23-24. As a result, none of claims 1-15 and 23-24 can be anticipated by Rowney. The applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-15 and 23-24.

The Patent Office interprets the intermediate station and the contact station as one unit. However, the intermediate station and the contact station could also be separate units. Even if the intermediate station and the contact station are considered one unit, Rowley still fails to disclose or suggest temporarily storing (i.e., buffering) encrypted key information and encrypted checking information in the intermediate station. The passage of Rowley cited by the official action (col. 13, lines 29-36) does not disclose or suggest temporary storage of any sort. Rather, this passage in Rowley teaches away from temporarily storing the information because Rowley teaches that the "merchant computer system 130 transmits merchant authorization request 315 to payment gateway system 140." *See* Rowley, col. 13, lines 34-36. There is simply no teaching of temporary storage of the merchant authorization request 315. Thus, Rowney cannot anticipate any of claims 1-15 and 23-24.

The method recited in independent claim 1 enables a document producer (i.e., user) to generate a forgery-proof document using cryptographic information provided by a contact station independently from any direct communication with the contact station. It is the temporary storage of the encrypted key information and the encrypted checking information in the intermediate station that allows this independent generation. Thus, a customer (i.e., document producer or user) may receive all necessary information for franking a mail piece (i.e., creating a forgery-proof document) from the manufacturer of a postage meter without communicating directly with the postal authority.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 16-22 as obvious over Rowney in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,724,894 to Singer ("Singer"). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach

or suggest all the claim limitations.” M.P.E.P. § 2143. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest all claim limitations. In particular, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest a method (or device) of generating forgery-proof documents comprising transmitting encrypted key information and encrypted checking information from a contact station to an intermediate station for temporary storage. As discussed above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections, Rowney fails to disclose or suggest this element.


Likewise, Singer fails to disclose or suggest a method (or device) of generating forgery-proof documents comprising transmitting encrypted key information and encrypted checking information from a contact station to an intermediate station for temporary storage, nor was Singer cited as showing this element. In particular, Singer discloses a cryptographic module and a method of operating the cryptographic module. However, Singer does not disclose or suggest transmitting encrypted key information and encrypted checking information to an intermediate station for temporary storage. Thus, Singer fails to correct the deficiency of Rowney. As a result, neither Rowney nor Singer, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 16-22. For this reason, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-22.

### Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, allowance of claims 1-24 is respectfully requested. No fees are believed due. However, if there are any fees or refunds required, the Commissioner is directed to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of Marshall, Gerstein & Borun LLP. A copy of this paper is enclosed herewith.

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form, in an effort to advance this application towards, allowance, the examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Respectfully submitted,  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

By:   
Michael A. Chinlund  
Reg. No. 55,064  
Agent for Applicants

February 2, 2007

6300 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300